

On the Odyssey-Codedness of Templism

This piece, originally titled Fragmentary February 2025 Writings, accidentally discovered the overall “vibe” of Templism, something that I (and others) previously thought it didn’t particularly have. It is of interest that the “vibe” of Templism is emergent from ideological facets that I didn’t think of in vibe-terms when I wrote them, whereas other philosophies often start with a vibe-idea and develop from there.

1

Only phenomena are certain to be true. There are also heuristics, which are true heuristic-phenomena. There are also lies, which are true lie-phenomena. It may be necessary for your practice of religion to be a layering of all three. The only thing it must avoid is *misconception*.

It is impossible to fully communicate this idea; you have to see it in your own consciousness, if you can.

2

All goofball-level superstition is caused by lack of self-awareness. This is apparent even upon a character analysis of people who are superstitious; there is evidently a very strong correlation between superstitious people and self-unaware people. The fundamental reason, is that self-unaware people cannot perceive what spiritual phenomena actually are within themselves. A Catholic can believe that the wafer is “literally an external God”, because he cannot perceive the thoughts and emotions conjured within him when eating it, sufficiently to understand that the “mystic Jesus juice” he imagines to coat the wafer is actually an idea in his mind. I believe that he can understand this to a certain extent if he is honest with himself, but he does not perceive it clearly enough for it to provide him with a definite answer to his mysticism.

You’ll notice that zealots of such superstitions often have a glassy-eyed physiognomy which telegraphs this to you. Such people may seem like they’re liars. They kind of are, but they are also lying to themselves. They are weak liars, prone to accept anything you tell them about their own experiences.

“If there's a man that you mistrust
and you want him to treat you well,
let your words be fair but false to your thought,
pay back lying with lies.” - Hávamál

3

Id, ego, super-ego, whatever; in the mind there are impulses, and character traits. “An animalistic id that only cares about aggression and sex” is a character trait, which Jung felt the need to express, according to an impulse, such as “I wish to express myself so that others may know me”. You are driven by impulses, not a demon or a saint, and your impulses will decide whether you manifest malevolent or benevolent character traits relative to the environment and your own genetic capabilities.

This thought comes in the wake of an aborted writing piece of mine, which claimed that men are driven by an internal *predatory animal* that influences which *ego-characters* they adopt. This theory was considered to be a perfection of the id, ego, and super-ego theory of Jung, with the *predatory animal* aspect, called the *wolf*, identified with the id, and the ego identified with characters *donned by the wolf like clothes*.

I was actually just hungry.

There is another fragment of that writing piece which ought to be preserved. To paraphrase: sometimes a person, especially someone from the Alpine/South German world, is tempted to treat the elements of their theories like gears. I mean for example, Jung comes up with the id, the ego, and the super-ego, and has a bias for fitting these pieces together. So he claims that the ego acts as a mediator between the animalistic desires of the id and the idealistic desires of the super-ego. Since he comes from a race that is disposed to manufacture cuckoo clocks, handcrafts, Glock pistols, etc, he may have felt a certain satisfaction that the elements of his theory were fitted together into a system, and he may have mistaken this satisfaction for truth. It is more accurate to simply describe things the way they appear to be, however connected or disconnected they are. Likewise in my aborted theory, I created a category called the *wolf*, and another category called *characters*, and I felt a certain compulsion to say that the *wolf* drives the *characters* because this made the elements into a satisfying system, when in reality the *wolf* was my own capacity for psychopathy cropping up as a result of hunger to the exclusion of other character traits. One ought to change his mindset from “trying to theorize” to “trying to see” if he wants to describe anything accurately. A lot of intellectuals ought really to be inventors or something like that. They are misapplying their intelligence when they engage in philosophy and science. This could well be attributed to a failure of the education system, since a person may not know that he is supposed to be an inventor if he is not acquainted with the tools and methods of invention. But to pick up a piece of paper and fuck up a bunch of people’s minds for centuries is readily available.

4

By a “principle”, I mean the regular definition of that word, but also the general concept of a “fixed idea”. For example, in the manner that Norse pagans fixate on “warrior aesthetics” to such a degree that it colors their entire religious worldview, such that these aesthetics and the things implied by them (honor, valor, etc) are followed by them as principles that inform their actions big and small - the honor with which they uphold financial agreements, to the valorous gusto with which they order food from a waitress, or whatever.

Functionally speaking, a set of principles are a fixed life-strategy that is pursued without continuous conscious thought. It is assumed or hoped that the strategy will work out in all or most circumstances. This is why people almost always choose ideologies germane to their lifestyles. A cop, for example, is going to select honesty, authority, and toughness as his principles, because these principles form the life-strategy that works as a rote mode of action for his usual life circumstances. If he found himself as a lawyer, this life-strategy would not work, but he is not a lawyer.

This life-strategy is often crafted by someone who is wiser than the person who believes it. They don't come up with it themselves, but are indoctrinated into it.

There are three cohorts of the population, often overlapping, who need to live by principles:

Retarded people: if you tell a retarded person he can do whatever he wants, it is no surprise that he is going to act like a retard. Since a lot of things are rather complex, the definition of "retard" here includes normies.

Hedonistic people: same as above.

Innately principled people: if you tell an innately principled person that he can do whatever he wants, and he believes you, he will become "ideologically non-principled", which is to say he will basically start LARPing as an unprincipled person in a way that is silly and unproductive. Pretty much all Nietzscheans, Satanists, Norse pagan warrior barbarians, etc, are of this ilk.

Therefore it is necessary for society to profess certain principles.

It is more potentially correct, yes, to be unprincipled, and to see the world as a set of elements, both mental and external, none of which are placed on an ideological pedestal, to manipulate as one desires. But in order for this to be viable, one must lack all three qualities above. It is known that mobility and intelligence, in nature, are positively correlated. This is basically a manifestation of that. When a sea squirt, beginning as a tadpole-like creature that seeks a place to anchor itself, finds and affixes itself to a suitable anchor point, its brain is destroyed in metamorphosis as it becomes a sort of barnacle. The cop, above, is like a barnacle, and only somebody "with a brain" can be trusted to know how to manipulate, i.e move freely about, his varied environment.

Knowing this, it is possible for an unprincipled person to support principles, to profess to believe them for utilitarian reasons, to at least respect them as purely memetic principles, etc. It is counterproductive for such a person to be publicly disgusted by the error of fixed ideas, and to seek to enlighten others against them. He's only going to make them retarded, hedonistic, and/or reverse-principled as a result. It is dubious if those who do seek to enlighten others against fixed ideas are ever "high functioning unprincipled types", since there is no pragmatic objective reason to enlighten others against fixed ideas. They always seem to be the likes of Nietzsche, praising the likes of Napoleon. Napoleon remarked that he was a Christian in Christian environments, a Muslim in Muslim environments, etc. He was a mobile environmental manipulator. Nietzsche was a "proponent of Napoleonic amorality" or whatever.

This particular "Nietzschean error" is solved by elitism. By which I mean, actual elitism. By understanding that Napoleon probably did see the world more objectively, and had a greater freedom of action, but that you are not, and never can be, Napoleon. And if you are Napoleon, you know that you have reason to manipulate others

with, rather than enlighten them from, fixed ideas. Given what I have said, it would be impossible to enlighten them even if you wanted to.

In short, everyone must participate in principles and there is no reason to do otherwise.

Templism is to a degree a middle ground. It is a religion for a dynamic sort of person. It allows us to be relatively mobile and intelligent, but to still be regulated by certain principles. We don't exercise the supreme hubris necessary to believe that we can figure out all situations using our own intelligence, but we do believe in multiple gods of multiple moral natures, a relatively dynamic morality, etc. This is a religion appropriate to Europeans, who are more intelligent than other populations, and known to be more mobile.

In Europe there exists the sociological tendency “low cultural context”. A graph describing low vs high context tendencies:

High and Low Context Cultures	
High Context	Low Context
Team focused	Individual focused
Cooperative in business	Competitive in business
Concerned with relationships	Concerned with tasks
Traditional	Innovative
Past oriented	Future oriented
Implicit communication	Explicit communication
Intuitive	Logical
Few tight relationships	Many loose relationships
Sensitive to politeness and social cues	Insensitive to politeness and social cues
Integrated command structure	Autonomous command structure
Focus on flexible processes	Focus on efficient end results
Conflicts are relational, vendettas, etc.	Conflicts are pragmatic, impersonal
Agreements are like hugs or hand shakes	Agreements are binding as explicitly stated
Customary way of organizing	Ad hoc way of organizing
In governance, corruption is the norm	Corruption is evil

Cultural context fundamentally involves the extent to which a culture believes in “relationship points”; Whether they are reciprocal about giving gifts - or expect gifts to be given altruistically, whether they respect the past - or look to the future, whether they keep old brands and memes for the sake of continuity - or discard them when they are no longer useful, etc. It is quite an influential cultural differentiator, which determines a lot of other cultural traits. It is possible that cultural context is itself determined by the innate monochronacy (tendency to focus on particular goals monomaniacally) or polychronacy (tendency to leave options open for multiple goals) of the population, but that is a theory for another time.

One word for “low cultural context” may simply be “Germanicism”, since all of the Germanic countries are markedly low cultural context. Germany, Switzerland, Netherlands, Sweden, etc, are the lowest context cultures in the world. England is predictably the highest among the lowest. The world outside of Northern Europe is invariably high cultural context, and Russia is high cultural context - I do not happen to know about Eastern Europe broadly, but since it is culturally similar to Russia it is probably the same, with the exception that Czechs do not seem to be very high cultural context, which is predictable considering that they have been in the Germanic sphere for so long. Swiss Germans are the lowest context population.

Low context cultures like to interpret statements and orders literally, while high context cultures interpret them subtextually.

During the Reformation, Christianity was reinterpreted by two markedly low context populations (North Germans, the Swiss). These populations wished to interpret the Bible literally and non-subtextually. I am not saying that this was the *raison d'être* of Protestantism; its cause and initial motivation are irrelevant in this, as it is only relevant that a new holistic interpretation of Christianity did originate from these areas, thus the Protestant reinterpretation was characteristic of the areas from which it originated. The problem is that the books of the Bible were recorded and developed by high context individuals (Jews and other Mediterraneans), and then the traditions of Christianity and Christian ecclesiastics were established by the same. It is obvious from reading the Bible, especially the New Testament, that it is not meant to be an absolutely exhaustive and literal instruction manual, as it is not thorough enough to be one. Therefore, when these low context Protestants tried to interpret it literally, in full confidence that God's exact will was contained literally within it, they actually interpreted it in a way that was alien to the mindset under which it was conceived. Since divine religious doctrines are designed intelligently, this means that they lost its moral guidance. It is like, conversely, if I give you a very specific written order, conceived by my own sagacity as a military commander, and you interpret this order subtextually, so as to then execute something different from that which is backed by my sagacity as a military commander.

This “problem of cultural translation” is known to occur in international business. The theory above is the same principle applied to religion. Given that it is known to occur in business communications, it seems reasonable that it would also occur in religious communications, setting aside any of the particular evidence for it.

So it is that Protestantism demonstrably spawned rather strange doctrines, as the Calvinist doctrine that God is essentially wrathful and sadistic, quickly decayed into a bunch of sects (because the Bible is subtextual, and therefore interpretable in a number of ways, and it does not literally offer an ecclesiastical solution to govern interpretation, yet it is necessary for a text interpretable in a number of ways to be interpreted by a hegemonic authority in order for there to be an orthodox conception of it), then decayed into irreligiosity as those sects

destroyed any orthodoxy with which to hold the population accountable to definite religious norms, and this lack of religiosity enabled the secular liberal ideals of the French Revolution and its consequences.

The solution for high context cultures is easy - just affirm the old traditions established by the Catholic Church, the Orthodox Church, etc. Low context individuals may be convinced to do this simply because it is necessary, e.g. to curtail degeneracy. But those who are more extremely on the low context end of the spectrum are not amenable to that, because they find those religious practices to be more grating. That is, it is fine to say that Catholicism is “necessary” to one who doesn’t really mind conceiving of the wafer as Christ, but to say that Catholicism is “necessary” to one who is averse to thinking mystically (as is a trait of low context cultures) in a way sufficient to conceive of the wafer as Christ, will seem like an inadequate intellectual trade to them. Historically, the terms of this trade could be improved in favor of acceptance, by the application of force and political pressure, but that is far from the reality now.

The only logical conclusion, is that the low context populations of Europe must be given a new religion crafted by an utter autist, which is *designed* to be interpreted and practiced in the way that such populations are wont to interpret and practice.

Such a religion, being new and strange, may be said to have more hurdles in front of it than merely convincing others of the necessity of e.g. Catholicism. But these hurdles are only initial, to do with the fact that it is at one time new and untested, whereas the problem concerning Catholicism is an ever-present feature of that religion in relation to the ever-present mindset of a low context individual.

Joseph Smith came closest to this, as he was willing not only to interpret Christianity, but to *make things up* according to his own low context inclinations, while also asserting an ecclesiastical hegemony. It is unsurprising that Mormonism appears to be the only successful Protestant sect, i.e. the only one which is not fragmented, immoral, infiltrated, powerless, etc.

What comes closer, in fact what fits the bill, is the doctrine of *Templism*, which has been developed over the course of the years 2022 to 2025. This religion, actually, was not created to solve the problem I just outlined. It was created according to the schizo-ideations of its author (“The Author”), who imagines pagan deities in his head that tell him to write certain things. Yet, it so happens to solve the problem I just outlined. Especially, because it is not prejudicial to other creeds, but rather takes a perennialist line, and also seems to contain a degree of optionality for higher context individuals within its own strictures, so that it will not simply cause the same “problem of cultural translation” in reverse.

Templism is more multifaceted than other religions, so it can appeal to all sorts of men. Peaceable men, warlike men, comical men, serious men, low context men, high context men, etc. Some may fail to see the core group that it most strongly attracts. All religions have one or a couple of these groups; for Islam, warriors, for Christianity, peaceniks, for Buddhism, monks, etc.

What is the core group attracted to a multifaceted religion, which often harps on the anthropological characteristics of various different types of people, from races, to classes, to psychological types, to Christian sects, to pagan sects, which aims to deliver accurate or strategically deceptive information, which talks about the utility of personality dynamism, which says that only those with the morality of “warlords” can see the world accurately without defensive coping mechanisms, which promises its adherents eternal strife via reincarnation rather than paradise, which conceives of itself as a strategic tool rather than an aimless schizophrenic epiphany, which bids its adherents to view the world as a set of “disparate manipulatable elements” rather than “monistic principles”, which says that unvirtuous men are designed to be utilized by and if necessary sacrificed for virtuous men, while virtuous men have a duty of care to one another whether they are friends or enemies, and whose ostensible primary divine influence (Wotan) is described as a *strategist*, a *gamer*, and a *shapeshifting monomaniac*?

O DIVINE POESY

Goddess-daughter of Zeus

Sustain for me

This song of the various-minded man,

Who after he had plundered

The innermost citadel of hallowed Troy

Was made to stray grievously

About the coasts of men,

The sports of their customs good or bad,

While his heart

Through all the seafaring

Ached in an agony to redeem himself

And bring his company safe home.

Vain hope - for them!

For his fellows he strove in vain,

Their own witlessness cast them away;

The fools,

To destroy for meat

The oxen of the most exalted sun!

Wherefore the sun-god blotted out
The day of their return.

Make the tale live for us
In all its many bearings,
O Muse

In this regard, a religious endeavor like Templism has never been tried. This cohort has never been unionized. Considering that it has been the dominant force in Europe for its entire history, due to the fact that Europe has historically consisted of highly fragmented factional conflict which opened up a consistent niche for wily tacticians to operate within, the results may be interesting. Especially so, as I have set before them a certain goal to accomplish, namely the conquest of the entire West followed by the colonization of space.

Although, it can be conjectured that this type of religion is essentially pagan, since there is some hint of the fact that all of the oracles, sorcerers, etc, of antiquity, generally regarded to be the highest authorities of the public faith, were essentially gamers, e.g in the manner that Merlin and Morgan basically orchestrated all of the events of Arthurian legend (by which I mean to imply the school of thought that Arthurian legend is much older than generally supposed, with several figures such as Morgan having clear parallels in Celtic pagan myths, in her case Morrígan. It is evident that the legend such as it now exists is based on folk tales that were later adapted by English historians and French storytellers. The existence of a historical Arthur in the time of the Saxons is dubious, as sources contemporary to that period do not mention him. The round table, introduced by French writers, is clearly inspired by the round table of Charlemagne), or in that Greek and Roman oracles decided war and peace by giving auguries that were in all probability strategically rather than schizophrenically decided. Pretty much all European pagan myths are about human affairs being orchestrated by scheming shapeshifter gods, as for example Athena went to Telemachus disguised as a male visitor, to tell him to seek his father, not so that he would actually find him, but so that his travels would win him the respect of other men.

This would be part of a general trend of Templism, that even though it is not an attempt to reconstruct ancient paganism, it ends up being more essentially pagan than all of the LARPers dancing around bonfires and dressing in outdated costumes. A commentator once said “Templists are the only pagans with pagan morality”. This is indirect proof that it is influenced by the gods of antiquity, rather than characters created by myself that are the same as them in name only.

The type of person described above may have problems with his self-conception. Especially if he isn't aware that he is like that, as then he may have a tendency to treat every personality change as an epiphany about his much sought after "true nature". The only fixed thing about him is his *will*, so if he wants to conceive of himself in a way that is fixed, he must understand himself as a "guy who wants things". Such a person is built for conscious goal-directed behavior rather than unconscious process-maintaining behavior, which is the reason Odysseus "works" as a character in the story he happens to play a part in - one could not easily portray a monofaceted POWERFUL WARRIOR like Achilles as questing for an objective by any means necessary. He works only in a story about war and "maintaining the processes associated with war". This means that "low cultural context" is a further part of the Odyssey-codedness of Templism, since it is (so I argue) driven by monochronacy, the tendency to do one thing at a time and to view time as linear and valuable, as a result of the tendency to focus on particular goals rather than general states of affairs.

Generally speaking, the anthropological difference being articulated in such various concepts, is that of mobility vs immobility. An immobile population maintains a general process, needs no ability to discover things, maintains a fixed character reputation, participates in fixed traditions, holds to very particular fixed principles, holds fast to existing relationships with others, expects the fruits of the environment to fall into its lap if the right processes are maintained, perceives itself as part of a timeless environment, needs no particular frenzy to seek after things, and needs no awareness of itself in relation to the environment. A mobile population, the opposite. Templism is a religion for a, most probably scattered but likely predominating in Germanic Europe (if low cultural context is any indication), mobile population.

The genesis of this type of human is arguable. Some may say that it is Aryan, steppe-like. It is true that Germanic populations, especially those that happen to be low cultural context (i.e North Germans in relation to South Germans), are more Aryan than other populations. However it is arguable that steppe conditions are actually kind of uniform, even though they involve the literal movement of the legs. Another potential explanation is that the genesis was in Scandinavia, where people did not live literally "mobile" lives but rather, to be more accurate, *variable* lives, i.e lives consisting of basically scrounging the environment for any possible sustenance, from fishing, to harvesting wood, to raiding, etc. A variation of this theory is that one need not look for a specific "point of genesis", but that "variable" living conditions apply their selective pressures repeatedly through history, and are often environmental niches filled by populations that are already variable. E.g the historical conditions of Germany and especially Switzerland, being not very arable and requiring all sorts of supplementary economic activity such as manufacturing, mercenarism, etc, or colonial America, or any locality with a maritime economy. Speaking of which, a third theory is that the genesis-conditions are particularly and exclusively maritime. This may explain why, as Templist Canon says, phenomenologically accurate philosophy has only ever been produced in insular maritime areas (Greece, England, around the North Sea and Black Sea), and as further evidence, many Königsberg philosophers who were not actually *from* that area nonetheless produced the usual dogshit, and vice versa (Schopenhauer being an example of "vice versa", as

his parents were Germans from Danzig and Gdańsk respectively, but he lived in Frankfurt. Not that his philosophy is really that great, but definitely more of an attempt to describe an actual sensory reality than Hegel, Nietzsche, et al). A fourth theory is that basically all of these things are true.

This cohort is well suited to accomplish the task I have set for it (or which the gods have set for it - I had no complete cognizance that I was selecting for such a cohort until now, actually); the Earth will die or suffer catastrophe sooner or later, whether by a meteor or by the sun. Immobile populations, affixed to their environments, are playing a life-strategy that is *limited*, even though they have no capacity or inclination to recognize this, or probably even to care. If you tell this information to some fucking African, you can expect a response like “oh. Kaboom, then we all go away, huh? Haha.” There is a cohort of the population for whom this is not just the whimsical fate of their eternal environment, but is an actual problem.

It can perhaps be seen that immobile populations have their own ways of foretelling this; they all seem to believe that a savior associated with the heavens will come to select who gets to make it and who does not. Here is a counterpoint: the Bible says that the antichrist would pretend to be the savior, but would not actually be the savior, and that he would bring a *sea beast* before the final judgement. Now you can decide if you want to believe in stories without any self-awareness, simply because they are attested, or if you want to live, using such stories for all that they have ever been used for, to manipulate immobile population cohorts who have no idea what’s going on, so as to cause them to act for purposes greater than their innate provincial barbarism.

8

When I look for an innate personality that drives other personalities, e.g a psychopathic character bent on world domination that drives the manifestation of a diplomatic character in order to strike a deal with someone else, I find no personality. Or, a minimal one, at any rate. What I find instead, is the world, and my multifaceted will in relation to the world. The evident thoughts, emotions, and objects thereof, and how I want them to be oriented. I find this worldview to be sublime, more than any neo-pagan “warrior rite” or Christian “nice guy incantation”, either of which I may engage in as circumstances require.

Not only is it sublime, but it has a good track record. Every group of rain-dancing fucking idiots in the world has been dominated by Europeans who knew how to manipulate the elements that were evident, including the rain-dances. The empowerment of inferior racial stocks, and of women who are known to be low in self-awareness, has somewhat reduced this tendency in European societies of today, but it is not absent or even difficult to find.

9

Being “the man of twists and turns” is itself a certain multifaceted characterization. It may well be true, but at any rate it is not my psychological focus, to “be the man of twists and turns”, or to “be fundamentally characterless”. My concern is with the world and the configuration of it.